







We the undersigned Shareholders for the purpose
of establishing a Newspaper in the County of
Mississineway to be conducted upon Constitutional
principles, do hereby authorise and empower
The Rev. James Reid - to represent our shares at any
meeting which may take place for the purpose
of nominating and appointing three discreet
persons as a Committee to carry into effect
the aforesaid object and transact all business
connected therewith, & also to insert the names of the
said Committee in the Subscription Paper to which our names are affixed.

Philipburgh 17th March 1835 -

J. Townsend

Gates Truliff
William Moore

J H Moore
Charles Miller

James Taylor

Lochwick & Street

Daniel Ford
John Mansour

Moratio A. May

E. Groff

A Chapman

J. P. Rotham.

W. W. Smith

Prentiss Hitchcock
C. Roberts

William Church
Lynds Smith Jr.

Mississineway
Gazette

Rev. J. Reid.

J. L. Attorney

MISSISSKOUÍ STANDARD.

VOLUME I.

FREELIGHSBURG, (L. C.) WEDNESDAY, APRIL 8, 1835.

NUMBER 1.

TERMS.

Ten shillings currency per year, payable at the end of six months. If paid in advance 1s. 3d. will be deducted. If delayed to the close of the year 1s. 3d. will be added for every six months delay. Grain and most kinds of produce taken in payment.

To mail subscribers the postage will be charged, in addition.

No paper discontinued, except at the discretion of the publishers, until arrears are paid.

RATES OF ADVERTISING.

Six lines and under, two shillings for the first insertion, and six pence for each subsequent insertion.

Above six lines and not exceeding ten two shillings and nine pence; every subsequent insertion seven pence half penny.

Above ten lines, three pence per line for the first insertion, and one penny for each subsequent insertion.

A liberal discount to those who advertise by the year.

Advertisements not otherwise ordered will be inserted till forbid in writing and charged accordingly.

All communications must be addressed to James Moir FERKES, Editor; and if by mail, post paid.

PROSPECTUS.

Attached to the British constitution of government, under which our principles and habits have been formed, both from principle and duty, and faithful to the King to whom we have sworn allegiance, we disclaim the apathy which would feel indifferent at a time when so venerable a fabric of human wisdom, emanating from the experience of ages, is assailed by virulence and misrepresentation.

Satisfied with that constitution which the mother country has given us, and only desirous that it should be truly and impartially administered for the equal protection and encouragement of all classes of our fellow subjects, without distinction of national origin, we have commenced the MISSISSKOUÍ STANDARD, to be issued once a week, wherein we intend to walk in the good old ways, and to shew, as much as we can, that loyalty is not slavery, and that the reform of real grievances is widely different from invading the constitution and reviling all that are in authority.

We advance no claim to public favour on the score of either learning or talents. We come forward to perform a public duty, honestly and fearlessly to defend the constitution under which we have the happiness to live, and to spread information, in a cheap form, through this section of the Eastern Townships, calculated to counteract the misrepresentations that are at work to deceive the people.

In the business of conducting a newspaper we are novices; but, taking the constitution of the country, the law of the land, and our own portion of general knowledge of men and things, for our guidance, we do not despair.

To look for perfection under any form of government is vain. But the constitution is one thing, and the administration of the government is another. The former may be as faultless as can be devised and accomplished by human wisdom; the latter may partake of the infirmities, ignorance, passions and prejudices of the men who conduct the administration, and in its operation may therefore be good or bad in proportion to the talents and capacity of those who stand at the helm. Hence some abuses are to be expected in the administrations of all governments. It is not our intention to conceal, palliate or defend them, but, to point them out wheresoever found, and by whomsoever practised, with a view to their redress. To this we pledge ourselves; not in the spirit of disaffection, or as seeking the pretext of a grievance, in order to enjoy the gratification of doling out complaints, but in the spirit of free-born subjects of a British king.

In the performance of our duty, and in defence of our principles, as conductors of a loyal and constitutional periodical we will speak out plainly, but not in the language of provocation, scurrility, defiance or personal abuse. We are now before the public. We address ourselves to reasonable men, and have no misgivings of the result.

The current news of the day will be given.

It shall be our endeavour to furnish something useful and instructive, if not entertaining to all classes of the community. Besides what we may glean from periodicals we shall be happy to receive original communications from intelligent farmers, containing such results of their experience in agricultural affairs as may be useful to others.

Education, and the promotion of temperance, will find in us zealous friends.

In short, it is our desire to make our labours useful, and fit to be received into any family; pledging ourselves that our columns will present something calculated to disseminate sound knowledge and promote harmony and good feeling in the community, without being sullied by scurrility, slander, irreligion or immorality.

From the Upper Canada Guardian of 1st March. PETITION of the Montreal Convention renewed by the House of Assembly.

The humble petition of the undersigned members elected to serve in the Assembly of Lower Canada, and of the members forming the minority of the Legislative Council who partake the opinions of the people, sheweth:—

That during the last Session of the Im-

perial Parliament the Commons of Lower Canada, in the name of the people whom they represent, approached your honourable House, by petition dated from Quebec, on the first day of March, one thousand eight hundred and thirty-four, setting forth the grievances which the people of the said Province suffered, arising out of the vicious principles upon which their Political Institutions are based, aggravated by a series of arbitrary Administrations to which the Province has been subjected. That the inquiry which was constituted before a select committee, appointed by your honourable House, upon Canada Affairs, on the fifteenth of April, one thousand eight hundred and thirty four, induced the people of Lower Canada to hope; that not only would the prayer of their Petition be listened to; but that the grievances therein set forth, which your Petitioners have reason to believe were fully supported, would be immediately redressed.

That this hope, which your Petitioners cannot deem unreasonable, was still further strengthened by the retirement of His Majesty's late Secretary of State for the Colonies, the Right Hon. E. G. Stanley, and the subsequent appointment of the Right Hon. T. Spring Rice, the more especially after the repeated declarations of the Right Hon. the Secretary of State for the colonies, that his Majesty's Government was actuated by the strongest desire to render justice to the People of this Province, by removing the various abuses under which they suffer, and affording to them security against the recurrence thereof.

That your Petitioners, however, regret to state that not only does the said Petition of the commons of Lower Canada to your Hon. House appear to have been totally neglected, but new abuses have been inflicted upon the people of this Province, which if not speedily removed, will tend to increase to an alarming degree, the discontents which have so long prevailed, and will ultimately alienate the affections of the People even from the Government of England itself.

That among the additional grievances of which the people of this Province have to complain, your petitioners would invite the attention of your Hon. House to the fact, that His Excellency Matthew Lord Aylmer is still continued in the Government of this province, after having been formally accused, in the aforesaid Petition, of "illegal, unjust and unconstitutional conduct," and after having borne himself towards the representatives of the people of Lower Canada, in a manner insulting to a body intrusted with Legislative functions and destructive of the respect which should be due to His Majesty's Representative.

That the acts of the Governor-in-Chief, of which the people of this Province still have to complain, were for the most part enumerated in the aforesaid Petition to your Hon. House; that since that time the vindictive and bitter feelings, together with the arbitrary and unbecoming conduct which His Excellency has displayed towards the people of this Province have created an universal feeling of discontent towards His Excellency's Administration.

That among the just subjects of complaint against the present Administration of this province, the system which is exhibited in the distribution of offices necessarily holds a conspicuous place; that the chief recommendation to office continues to be a display of marked and bitter animosity towards the majority of the people of this Province; that it is seldom men of French Canadian origin find their way into office under any circumstances, but when they are appointed, it is not until they have alienated themselves from the sympathies of the people and allied themselves with the factious minority opposed to the wishes and interests of the country; and that even the sacred character of justice has been recently polluted in its source, by the appointing to the high office of Judge of the King's Bench for the district of Montreal, a man who was a violent and decided partisan of the Administration of the Earl of Dalhousie, and the declared enemy of the laws which he is sworn to administer; and also by the appointment of a greater number of commissioners for the trial of small causes in different parts of the country, intentionally selected on the eve of a general Election from among the notorious partisans of the present Administration.

That another cause of complaint which has arisen since the aforesaid petition of the Commons of this Province to your honourable house, your petitioners abstain from aluding at any length to the insuperable differences and the ever widening breach between the House of Assembly and the Legislative Council of this Province—differences springing out of the very constitution of the latter body. Nevertheless your petitioners cannot avoid reminding your honourable house, that this aforesaid petition contained a prayer that the Legislative Council, as at present constituted, be abolished, and that the people of this Province be empowered to elect the second branch of the Legislature in future, as the only means of producing that harmony, without which internal peace and good government cannot exist.

That as an evidence that the people at large fully participate in the opinions of the majority of the House of Assembly, your petitioners take leave to refer your

honourable House to the result of the recent Elections, in the said Province of Lower Canada, which avowedly turned upon the approval or disapproval of the Elective principle, and which result is almost unanimously in favour of the said principle.

Therefore, your petitioners expressing the sentiments of the majority of the inhabitants of Lower Canada, pray your honourable House to comply with the prayer of the aforesaid petition of the Commons of Lower Canada, dated on the first of March last; and also with that of the present petition, by removing the abuses and grievances set forth therein, so that full justice be rendered to the House of Assembly and to the People whom it represents, and your petitioners will ever pray.

Lower Canada, December, 1834.

Brief remarks by the Editor of the *Guardian*, on Lower Canada Affairs; and a few thoughts on several questions of constitutional government in the British colonies.

On comparing the statements of the English party with the foregoing statements put forth by the French party, it will be found that the leading point of difference in regard to the *principles* of Government are the following:—(1) The French party seek the abolition of both the Executive and Legislative Councils as they are now established, and have them made analogous to the United States Senate and Cabinet; the English party, consisting of the great body of the English, Irish, Scotch, and American population, wish to have the Executive and Legislative Councils continued as they are and have been for these forty years established by the Constitution; but extended and rendered more efficient in accordance with the increasing population and advancing state of the Province. (2) The French party, as they constitute the majority of the Province, claim the representation of it by their own nation, as it appears from the late general elections and various of their publications, and the control of the Executive department of the Government also; the English party claim to be represented by a proportionate number of persons of their own language and feelings, to protect their commercial and agricultural interests, and that persons shall be appointed to offices according to their qualifications and merits, without any regard to their national origin. (3) The French party claim the entire control of the Crown as well as the Provincial Revenues; the English party maintain the prerogative of the Crown on the one hand, as well as that of the *House of Assembly* on the other. (4) The French party claim *elective* instead of *monarchical* institutions; The English party contend for the connexion with the Mother Country as it now exists, and the integrity of the constitution.

Such appear to be the leading principles which distinguish the respective parties. We will offer a few remarks on some of the statements contained in the petition of the French party, which apply generally to all British colonies.

1. One allegation is, that the Governor has not been removed, though he has been formally accused of illegal, unjust, and unconstitutional conduct, and of having borne himself towards the representatives of the people of Lower Canada in a manner insulting to a body entrusted with the Legislative functions," etc. If every man must be condemned because he is accused, few public men or bodies of men would escape. The accusation of an individual or a party, is not proof. The Committee of the *House of Commons* did inquire into the allegations of the French party; but its decision and that of the Home Government did not answer the wishes of the accusers, and therefore their affections will be "ultimately alienated even from the government of England itself!" As far as we can recollect, not a word dropped from Lord Aylmer in any of his communications with the *House of Assembly*, that could be considered in the least degree uncourtous, until after the House had censured and impeached him, and what he said then was in vindication of his own administration. What an infringement upon the "inalienable rights of self-government" it is, that all accusers are not allowed to be the absolute judge and jury in their own case!

2. Another complaint is, that the Governor did not grant to the Montreal City Council a sum of money out of the public funds, to aid in forwarding emigrants to their places of destination, and to extend the Quarantine regulations to the Port of Montreal. We would offer no justification of the Governor's conduct in this case. But it is singular to see His Excellency complained of, for not doing in 1834 what he was complained of by the same party for doing in 1832; and especially when the Common Council of Montreal might have borrowed money upon their own responsibility, and looked to the *House of Assembly* to reimburse it, as well as for his Excellency to do so, and to subject himself to impeachment again, for granting money without the consent of the representatives of the people.

3. The King and parliament are also charged with violating the "most important and indisputable of the birth-rights of British subjects," in sanctioning the sale

of a quantity of the Crown Lands to several individuals using the title of the "British North American Land Company." This act is declared to be "unconstitutional taxation"—and those lands are claimed as the "property of the province." It is a home thief indeed, to charge the parent Government with violating the Constitution—yet the same charge on the same ground has been made in Upper Canada also. As it therefore concerns the prerogative of the Crown, and the very existence of the provinces as British colonies, it is important to examine it. First, as to "constitutional taxation." How does it appear that selling a quantity of the waste lands of the crown is "taxation" at all?

What tax does it impose upon a single inhabitant of any British colony? Does it not, on the contrary, contribute to the settlement of these wild lands, and add to the value of landed property in the colony generally? This is indeed a new version of "taxation." But how does it appear that these lands are the "property of the province?" Did not the whole of these colonies once belong absolutely to the Crown of Great Britain and Ireland? No one can deny this. It thence follows that those parts of these provinces which the King has not given to the colonists or colonial legislatures still belong to the crown. Have these lands then ever been given to the provinces by any order of the King's Government? No. Have they been given to the provinces by even a resolution of any branch of the British Government? No. Does the provincial charters or constitutional acts which established local legislatures, concede these lands to the provinces? No. The very Acts which authorise the inhabitants of these provinces to elect representatives, and those representatives to legislate for their constituents, authorise his Majesty to dispose of these lands as he pleases; and it is no more a violation of the constitution for his Majesty to dispose of these lands to individuals or companies than it is for a colonial representative to sit in a *House of Assembly* and legislate. And it is as much a subversion of the constitution to infringe the prerogative of the crown as it is to infringe the right of the subject. Both are equally established by law. The "property of the Province" is that which the *Constitution* of the Province places at the disposal of the Provincial Legislature; the property of the crown is that which the constitution places at the disposal of his Majesty. There were no legislatures in the colonies until an Act of the Imperial Parliament created them. Those legislatures therefore can possess no power which is not given them in the Act by which they were established, any more than the common council of the city of Toronto, Montreal or Quebec, can constitutionally exercise powers not given in the Act of Parliament by which it was created. Every man who has settled or been born in the Provinces is bound by *tacit consent* or *oath of allegiance* to maintain the rights and dignity of the crown; and the constitution of the province declares what those rights are. The claims, therefore, of the Papineau party, and all enlisted with them, are not only a blow at the constitution and a denial of the Royal prerogative, but involve the subversion of all moral obligations to support or obey any established constitution of government, making allegiance to it a mere question of expediency, like the holding or selling of a farm, or the wearing of a top coat. This is going back to natural rights and the law of nature with a vengeance. Nay, nay,—let true economy in the public expenditure be observed—let every act and department of the administration be watched and scrutinized—let every abuse be corrected—let every laudable enterprise and improvement be promoted—but let the *Constitution* (to which attachment has been professed and allegiance sworn) remain sacred.

But it may be said, these crown lands were worth very little 30 years ago, but by the enterprise and industry of the inhabitants they have become valuable—therefore, the crown has no right to them any longer. The conclusion does not follow from the premises. The increased value of property in the colonies does not annihilate the rights of the crown any more than it annihilates the rights of an individual. It is true that the crown lands were of little value 30 years ago, and it is also true the lands of individuals were of as little value. It is likewise true that whilst the value of the crown lands has been increased by the settlement and labour of the inhabitants, the value of their lands has been equally increased by the protection, and encouragement and expenditures of the crown—and that at a great annual expense to the British nation, without one farthing's return for many years. With equal propriety might not the British government say to these doughty patriots, "Most of you were worth nothing when you came to the province—all you possess you have acquired under the constitution, against which you now complain—to many of you lands were given with merely paying a small office fee—we protect your lives, property and commerce—encourage the sale of your produce—

pended vast sums of money in maintaining a government among you, erecting fortifications and making improvements—you ought now to contribute something to reimburse these expenditures." But the British government holds no such language. It has even given up to the colonial legislature revenues which were formerly at its own disposal. But because a man has generously given one hundred pounds, it does not follow that he should be compelled to give two hundred more. So large have been the expenditures of the home government upon these colonies, that even Mr. Hume is reported to have said in the House of Commons, "the North American colonies are a mill stone round the neck of Great Britain, and the sooner they are cut loose the better." And yet such patriots endeavour, on the other hand, to make the colonists believe the government of the mother country is a "baneful domination."

It may, however, be asked, ought these lands to be disposed of by the provincial legislature? We answer, if his Majesty pleases—there is no constitutional or legal authority for it—not even the law of equity, unless it can be shown that the British government has been reimbursed for its expenditures upon these provinces. In the United States, the public lands in the different States are not granted or disposed of by the local state governments, but by the General (or Imperial) Government, and the proceeds go into the national funds. The fact, that much more than the proceeds of the sales of crown lands has been annually expended within the province, is continual proof of the parental kindness and unbounded generosity of the British government. If therefore, the disposal of the crown revenues or any portion be asked by the provincial legislature, they can only with reason be asked as a *favour*, but can never be demanded as a *right*; for these lands are not and never were the property of the provinces any more than the bank of England, or than certain crown lands and crown revenues in England, which the King disposes of independently of the House of Commons, and the control of which the House of Commons has never pretended to claim.

How groundless, therefore are the vapourings about "unconstitutional taxation," "violation of the constitution," &c. But they are full of meaning when coupled with such declarations as the following: "Rightful and successful resistance of the former British colonies and their dismemberment from the British Empire"—"the people of the old colonies, now the United States, had *much less* to complain of than the people of this province"—"virtual dissolution of the constitution, and for the consequences, of which your petitioners cannot answer." This language is quite intelligible, backed as it is with similar language from the leading newspaper organs of the party, one of which says—"It is for the government to attend to these remonstrances, if it would save the colony to Great Britain"—"Step by step are they (the people of this colony) treading the same ground which has already been travelled by *other colonies*." Such allusions, and statements, and appeals, cannot be misunderstood—and are evidently designed to inflame the uninformed part of the colonists, more than to enlighten the King's government.

4. Another ground of complaint is the "distribution of office." Comparatively few Frenchmen were qualified to discharge the duties of any public office under an English Government with English laws, until very recently; and from authentic statements, it appears that a larger number of persons of French origin have been appointed to office since 1828 than of British and American origin. But this does not alter the case, it appears, unless the persons appointed to office possess the "sympathies" of the party claiming "elective institutions." But surely if a man wanted to employ an agent to transact his business for him, and two persons equally well qualified, but of opposite principles and feelings, were presented to him, he would rather employ the one who was known to agree with him in principle and to be friendly to his interests, than the one who had done all in his power to malign his character and destroy his influence?

5. Another charge against the King's government is the appointment of a person to a judicial situation who had taken a part in politics. If there be any reason in such an accusation, it applies equally against all governments. The heads of the judiciary in Great Britain and the United States are men who have distinguished themselves as politicians as well as in their profession. Who are the present Chief Judges of England, and Scotland, and Ireland, and in the United States, but men who have long filled most conspicuous places in the political history of those nations? And what Barrister of eminent abilities is there in any of the Provinces who has not taken an active part in politics? And would there not be much louder complaints, and with more reason too, if strangers were appointed to judicial situations in the colonies? Perhaps there are few warmer political partisans than the late Mayor of the city of Toronto; yet he did not consider himself disqualified from judicial duties on this ground—nor did the advocates of "elective institutions" ever urge this as an objection; nor could the present Hon. Speaker of the House of Assembly, or any other professional man of requisite qualifications, be reasonably objected to as a judicial officer on account of his being an eminent politician. The Bench of England has been renowned for its wisdom and

impartiality among all civilized nations; yet has there scarcely been a Judge of eminence as a politician. The complaints, therefore, against the appointments of political men to judicial situations in the colonies apply equally against the governments of England and the United States as against those of the colonies, and can only therefore be put forth from ignorance, or personal animosity, or private ambition, alarming the less informed with phantoms, and exciting them unconsciously, and when they think they are discharging important duties, to subvert the institutions under which they live, and under which they might live happily as they do prosperously.

6. But the real objects and principles of the French party and their coadjutors in other colonies are made manifest beyond a doubt, when they declare that all the grievances under which they say the people suffer, "arise out of the vicious principles on which their political institutions are based," and are only "aggravated" (not originated) by "arbitrary administrations." It is remarkable that up to 1832 (previous, as we believe, to the formation of a plan between certain political economists in London and from the colonies to effect the independence of these colonies) the most enthusiastic admiration of the constitution of the colonies (or, in other words, the "principles upon which our political institutions are based") was expressed by Mr. Papineau and his party in Lower Canada and their friends in the Upper Province,—they declared their readiness to defend the constitution with their lives, and their determination to transmit it unimpaired to their posterity—they only complained of the manner in which it had been administered in certain cases. We believed, and do still believe, that many of their complaints were well founded, but many of the evils complained of have since been removed by his Majesty's government. January 28th, 1831, Mr. Papineau and the Assembly of Lower Canada, by an unanimous vote, addressed the Governor as follows: "It will be our earnest desire, that harmony may prevail among the several branches of the legislature, that full effect may be given to the *Constitution*, as established by *law*, and that it may be transmitted, *unimpaired*, to our posterity."

Such were the language and professed sentiments of Mr. Papineau and his coadjutors in both Provinces in 1831: but, behold, in 1835 they find that all the evils under which they suffer "arise" from the "vicious principles" of that very constitution which, in 1831 they wished to "transmit, *unimpaired*, to posterity." Our views of the constitution in 1835 are the same as they were in 1831. Then it was a war against *abuse*; now it is a war against the *Constitution*. Those who wish to follow them from the former to the latter may do so. Against the constituted government, or the "powers that be," we believe no man can make war without "resisting the ordinance of God;" but *abuse* in the government ought at all times to be carefully inquired into and thoroughly purged by the appointed representatives and guardians of the people's rights and interests.

QUEBEC CONSTITUTIONAL ASSOCIATION.

A general meeting of this association took place at the Albion hotel last evening, (says the Mercury of 21st March,) to take into consideration the expediency of sending a fit and proper person to England, to support the petition of the association, and in the case of such measure being deemed expedient, to proceed to the nomination of such person. Andrew Stewart, Esq., chairman, and R. H. Gardner, Esq., secretary.

REPORT.

The executive committee since the date of its report of the 5th February last, has been chiefly engaged in preparing and forwarding for signature, the petition to His Majesty and both houses of Parliament then adopted.

By the zealous exertions of a number of gentlemen who volunteered their services in Quebec, the petitions have been generally signed in the different wards of this city.

Copies have also been forwarded to the following associations in the country parts, to receive signatures:

Richmond, Durham, Kingsley, Leeds, Ireland, Ste. Marie, Frampton, Halifax, St. Charles, Belle-Aliance, Valcartier, Stone lake, Beauport, Three-Rivers and Kildare.

Of these, only one has yet been returned. Since the last report, the executive committee has entered into correspondence with the following branches, viz:

Uper Ireland and Halifax branch constitutional associations, Valcartier do, do Stonham do, St. Francis branch of the Quebec association, Kingsley do, Inverness do, Sylvester do, Kildare do, Missiskoui and lake Beauport.

The committee has also continued its exertions in forwarding information, and in corresponding with individuals in different counties, in which the majority of the population is of French origin, chiefly with a view to guard them against the misrepresentations which are so frequently circulated. They have also corresponded with the Montreal constitutional association, and have had communications with the hon. Mr. Moffatt, its chairman, and with several members of the house of assembly for the townships on the Ottawa, the Missiskoui and St. Francis, on the general measures proper to be taken in support of the petitions now in the course of signature, and are happy to find a general agreement on the subject.

The period is now arrived when it becomes urgent to forward the petitions, and the result of the session of the legislature furnishes additional motives for continued exertion, to relieve the country from the pressure on its industry and prosperity, which must follow the renewed failure of all legislative business.

A. STUART, Chairman.
R. H. GARDNER, Secretary.
Quebec, 19th March, 1835.

The following extracts from the minutes of the proceedings of the executive committee was read:

Thursday, 12th March, 1835.

"Resolved, on motion of Mr. Kerr, seconded by Mr. LeMesurier:

"That it is expedient that a person be sent to England, to support the prayer of the petition of this association."

ANDREW STUART, Esq. addressed the meeting. He said they had just heard the report of the executive committee, which they had named, containing a relation of its general proceedings, and a recommendation to adopt a measure connected with the general interests of the association. With respect to the first part of the report, it contained a continuation of the information which the committee were called upon to furnish from time to time, and he trusted would be found satisfactory to the whole of the members of the association. With respect to the second part, it was necessary for him, in elucidation of it, to look back to the causes which had led to the formation of the association, and the various measures which had resulted from it. It became his duty as an organ of the executive committee, to state succinctly the present position of affairs, as far as he understood them. At the time this association was established, it was quite evident to every person who paid any attention to the affairs of the province, that it was necessary to dispatch a gentleman to England to support the prayer of the petition. We had seen as late back as 1828 it was found necessary to send a person home, and the result of that mission was well known to all. He doubted not that in the present instance we would succeed to the utmost of our wishes. He then moved the 1st resolution as follows:

J. H. KERR, Esq. on proposing the first resolution said, that he did not believe that there was a single member of the association who would not see that it was absolutely necessary to dispatch a gentleman to England to support the prayer of the petition. We had seen as late back as 1828 it was found necessary to send a person home, and the result of that mission was well known to all. He doubted not that in the present instance we would succeed to the utmost of our wishes. He then moved the 1st resolution as follows:

J. H. KERR, Esq. seconded by John Fraser, Esq. moved, "That John Neilson, Esq., in whose fitness, in every respect, the Quebec constitutional association has an entire confidence, be requested to proceed to England as such an agent." [Passed unanimously with enthusiastic acclamation.]

JOHN NEILSON, Esquire, said, that it

was impossible for him to resist the wishes

of so many respectable fellow citizens, and he must accede to their desires. [Great cheering.] although he had confidently ex-

pected that he would never again be called

upon to leave his family and his home. In

leaving them at present he would at least

be supported by the conviction of doing

what was just in supporting the prayer of

the petition with which he was to be en-

trusted. He hoped that his exertions

would answer the expectations of the asso-

ciation, which was all that he desired.—[Tremendous cheering.]

6th. John Fraser, Esq. seconded by J.

G. Clapham, Esq. moved, "That a sub-

scription be now opened to cover the

expenses to be incurred by the said agent,

and that the executive committee do furnish

him with such documents, information and

instructions as may be deemed necessary

for his mission, and do correspond with him

during his absence." [Passed unanimously.]

7th. John Strang, Esq. moved, seconded

by John Jones, Junr. Esq. "That the

foregoing resolutions be communicated to

the Montreal constitutional association and

the different branches in correspondence

with this association." [Passed unanimously.]

8th. P. Langlois, Esq. moved, seconded

by James Dean, Esq. "That the petitions

sent out by this association for signature be

returned to the secretary of the association

or before the 1st proximo."—[Passed unanimously.]

The president said it was of the last

degree of importance that the petitions

should be all returned on or before the 1st

April. The time was extremely short; and

he was satisfied that every gentleman would

see the necessity of using all possible dilig-

ence in this respect.

After a few remarks by Mr. NEILSON,

on the urgent necessity of the petitions

being sent in with the least possible delay,

the chairman left the chair, and J. H. Kerr,

Esq. was called to it, and thanks voted to

Andrew Stuart, Esquire.

before he rose] he must call upon them to stand forth and rally round the standard of loyalty. When we are told to look to republican America, let us say that the throne of England is the people's choice, and we are determined to support it. [Great cheering.] Such being the case, and as it was absolutely necessary that a person should be sent home to support the prayer of the petition, he would propose as such emissary, the name of a gentleman, who, as he was present, he would not offend his delicacy by passing any encumbrance on him. He was a gentleman who had rendered services to this country which were second to none: in short he would propose JOHN NEILSON, Esq. [Long continued and denting cheers.] Our adversaries have stated we are enemies to rational liberty, they would however soon find out whether we are or not. Mr. D. on concluding his highly spirited address, of which the foregoing is but a faint sketch, expressed a confident hope, that our efforts to obtain rational liberty and equal laws to all his Majesty's subjects in this province would be attended with complete success. [Long and repeated cheers.] He then proposed the 5th resolution, as follows:

5. John Duval, Esq. seconded by H.

LeMesurier, Esq. moved, "That John

Neilson, of Quebec, Esquire, in whose

fitness, in every respect, the Quebec con-

stitutional association has an entire confi-

dence, be requested to proceed to England

as such an agent." [Passed unanimously with enthusiastic acclamation.]

JOHN NEILSON, Esquire, said, that it

was impossible for him to resist the wishes

of so many respectable fellow citizens, and he must accede to their desires. [Great cheering.] although he had confidently ex-

pected that he would never again be called

upon to leave his family and his home. In

leaving them at present he would at least

be supported by the conviction of doing

what was just in supporting the prayer of

the petition with which he was to be en-

trusted. He hoped that his exertions

would answer the expectations of the asso-

ciation, which was all that he desired.—[Tremendous cheering.]

6th. John Fraser, Esq. seconded by J.

G. Clapham, Esq. moved, "That a sub-

scription be now opened to cover the

expenses to be incurred by the said agent,

and that the executive committee do furnish

him with such documents, information and

instructions as may be deemed necessary

for his mission, and do correspond with him

during his absence." [Passed unanimously.]

7th. John Strang, Esq. moved, seconded

by John Jones, Junr. Esq. "That the

foregoing resolutions be communicated to

the Montreal constitutional association and

the different branches in correspondence

with this association." [Passed unanimously.]

8th. P. Langlois, Esq. moved, seconded

by James Dean, Esq. "That the petitions

sent out by this association for signature be

returned to the secretary of the association

or before the 1st proximo."—[Passed unanimously.]

The president said it was of the last

degree of importance that the petitions

should be all returned on or before the 1st

April.